

No. 9(1)82-6Lab./7355.— In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Indogem Pharmaceuticals, 99, Sector-6, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 15 of 1982

between

SHRI AMINI, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S. INDOGEM PHARMACEUTICALS 99, SECTOR-6, FARIDABAD

Shri M. K. Bhandari, for the workman.
None for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 15 of 1982 has been referred to this Court, by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/132-81/2495, dated 13th January, 1982 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 existing between Shri Amini, workman and the Respondent management of M/s Indogem Pharmaceuticals 99, Sector-6, Faridabad. The term of the reference was.—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Amini was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The service of summons has been effected the management. But on 18th March, 1982 neither the management nor their representative was present. It was already 3 P.M. The case was called thrice. In these circumstances, I proceeded *ex parte* against the management and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the workman. Four adjournment had already been given to the representative of the workman for his purpose but he failed to do so. On 2nd June, 1982 the representative of the workman made a statement in this Court that he had also informed to the workman about his case but the workman did not come and not give any authority letter. He further stated that he had no instructions from the workman to pursue his case. In these circumstances I hold that the workman is not interested to pursue his case and the reference is dismissed in default of the workman and there is no dispute between the parties. No orders as to costs. I give my award accordingly.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1565, dated the 14th July, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH, KAUSHIK.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab./7356.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the Respondent management of M/s. Super Engineering Works, Plot No. 11-12, Gurukul Road, Amar Nagar, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD
Reference Nos. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 & 47 of 1982

between

S/SHRI DINESH, DEV MUNNI, MANUJA MUDEEN KHAN, SUBHASH, PHOOL MOHAMMAD, DALIP AND RAJESH KHANNA, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S SUPER ENGINEERING WORKS, PLOT NO. 11-12, GURUKUL ROAD, AMAR NAGAR, FARIDABAD

Present: Shri Roshan Lal Sharma, for the workman.
None, for the management.

AWARD

These references Nos. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 47 of 1982 have been referred to this Court, by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order Nos. ID/FD/14/82/7973, 15/7966, 16/7959, 18/7952, 17/7945, dated 24th February, 1982, 19/8076, dated 25th February, 1982 and 13/8301, dated 26th February, 1982 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, existing between S/Shri Dinesh, Dev Munni, Manuja Mudeen Khan, Subhash, Phool Mohammad, Dalip and Rajesh Khanna workman and the respondent management of M/s. Super Engineering Works Plot No. 11-12, Gurukul Road, Amar Nagar, Faridabad. The terms of the reference were :—

Whether the termination of services of S/Shri Dinesh, Dev Munni, Manuja Mudeen Khan, Subhash, Phool Mohammad, Dalip and Rajesh Khanna were justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

After receiving these seven references, notices were sent to parties. The summons sent to the management returned back with the peon & postal authorities remarks that refused. In these circumstances I proceeded *ex parte* against the management. On the request of the representative of the workmen these cases were consolidated on 5th May, 1982 and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the workmen. On 1st June, 1982 neither the workmen nor their representative is present. It was already 12-10 P.M. The case was called thrice. In these circumstances, I feel that the workmen are not interested to pursue their case and these references are dismissed in default of the workmen. No orders as to costs. I give my award accordingly.

Dated the 1st July, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1566, dated the 14th July, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledge within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6 Lab./7358.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XLV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Buta Singh Plating ways 11/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 52 of 1982

between

SHRI DEV NARAYAN, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S
BUTA SINGH PLATING WAYS 11/7, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present : Shri Roshan Lal Sharma, for the workman.

None for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 52 of 1982 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/271/81/11142, dated 17th March, 1982 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Dev Narayan, workman and the respondent management of M/s Buta Singh Plating Ways, 11/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Dev Narayan was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The notice of the management returned back with the peon's remarks that the name of the factory was not correct and their factory's name is Buta Singh & Bros, 11/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad. Then the case was fixed for filing of the correct address of the management by the workman. On 22nd May, 1982 neither the workman nor his representative was present. It was already 11.20 A.M. The case was called thrice. In these circumstances, I feel that the workman is not interested to pursue his case and I hold that the reference is bad in law and dismissed in the default. No orders as to cost. I give my award accordingly.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Dated the 2nd July, 1982.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1568, dated the 14th July, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 17th September, 1982

No. 9(1)-82-6Lab./9001.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Isherheri Coop. Credit and Services Society Ltd., Isherheri (Kurukshetra).

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 24 of 1982

between

SHRI HARPHOOL SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF
M/S ISHARHERI COOP. CREDIT AND SERVICES SOCIETY LTD., ISHARHERI
(KURUKSHETRA)

Present :

Workman with Shri Rajeshwar Nath.

None, for the respondent management.

AWARD

This reference No. 24 of 1982 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/Amb./189/81/3512, dated 20th January, 1982, under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, existing between Shri Harphool Singh, workman and the respondent management of M/s Isherheri Coop. Credit and Service Society Ltd., Isherheri (Kurukshetra). The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Harphool Singh, was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were sent to the parties for 9th March, 1982. On that day both the parties appeared and the case was adjourned to file the written statement for 8th April, 1982. On that day none was present from the side of the management. So I proceeded *ex parte* against the respondent and fixed the case for recording of *ex parte* evidence of the workman. After taking one adjournment the *ex parte* evidence of the workman was recorded on 5th July, 1982.

The workman appeared as WW-1 who has stated that he was working as clerk with the respondent society from 23rd November, 1979. The copy of appointment letter is Exhibit W-1. The respondent society has terminated his services without giving any notice, chargesheet or enquiry on 5th October, 1981. The management has also not paid the retrenchment compensation to the workman. He stated that his last wages were Rs. 350 per mensem. He further stated that he was working his work to the entire satisfaction of the respondent and never gave any chance of complaint. He further stated that he is un-employed in these days. So he may be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex parte* statement of the workman, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the workman. The workman was terminated without giving any chargesheet or holding any enquiry. So on believing *ex parte* statement of the workman I give my award that the termination of service of the workman was neither justified nor in order. The workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated, the 19th August, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1900, dated the 26th August, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

H. L. GUGNANI,

Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Labour Employment Department.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab./7359.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. S. M. Engineering Works, 16/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 66 of 1982

between

SHRI RAM BABU JHA, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S S. M.
ENGINEERING WORKS, 16/5, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :— Shri H. P. Singh, for the workman,

None for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 66 of 1982 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/29/82/16376, dated 26th March, 1982 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ram Babu Jha, workman and the respondent management of M/s S. M. Engineering Works, 16/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of Services of Shri Ram Babu Jha was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The notice of the management returned back with the Peon's remarks that the factory's name was not correct and the case was fixed for filing of the correct address of the management. On 19th June, 1982 neither the workman nor his representative was present. It was already 12.10 P. M. The case was called thrice. In these circumstances, I feel that the workman is not interested to pursue his case and I hold that the reference is bad in law and dismissed in default. No orders as to costs. I give my award accordingly.

Dated, the 2nd July, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1569, dated the 14th July, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab./7382.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Ram Parkash Metal Works, Court Road, Jagadhri: —

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR, COURT HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 137 of 1979

(Fbd. 324 of 1981)

between

SHRI RAM KISHAN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S RAM PARKASH METAL WORKS, COURT ROAD, JAGADHRI

Present:—

Shri Surinder Kumar for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chand for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 137 of 1979 has been referred to the Labour Court, Rohtak by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/VMN/68-79/27154, dated 26th June, 1982 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ram Kishan workman and the management of M/s Ram Parkash Metal Works, Court Road, Jagadhri. The term of the reference was: —

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ram Kishan, workman, was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties by the Labour Court, Rohtak. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. After that the Haryana Government transferred this case to this Court,—vide order No. 1 (79)-80-1 Lab, dated 20th October, 1981. And this case was received in this Court in December, 1981 in reference No. Fbd. 324/1981.

After receiving this case file, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared. On 5th July, 1982, the case was fixed for the evidence of the parties, but neither the workman nor his representative was present. It was already 1.10 P. M. the case was called thrice.

In these circumstances, I hold that the workman is not interested to pursue his case and the reference is dismissed in default of the workman. I give my award accordingly. No orders as to costs.

Dated the 8th July, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1592, dated the 14th July, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 2nd September, 1982

No. 9(1)82-6Lab/7587.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Himalaya Timber Works, Industrial Area, Yamuna Nagar:—

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 271 of 1978

between

SHRI KASTURI LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HIMALAYA TIMBER WORKS, INDUSTRIAL AREA, YAMUNANAGAR

Present:—

- No one for the workman.
- Shri Wazir Chand Sharma for the management.

AWARD

This reference has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor,—*vide* his order No. ID/Ymn/69-78/39042, dated 28th August, 1978 under section 10(i) (c) of the I. D. Act for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Kasturi Lal, workman and the management of M/s Himalaya Timber Works, Yamuna Nagar. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Kasturi Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties appeared, filed their respective pleadings. The following issues were framed on the basis of the pleas of the parties:—

- (1) Whether the workman left the service of his own?
- (2) Whether there was no dispute existing?
- (3) If issue Nos. 1 & 2 are decided against the management whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order?
- (4) If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The management examined Shri Ram Sapup, contractor respondent-management. Shri H. C. Bhatnagar, Head Clerk Labour Officer, Yamuna-Nagar, Shri Surinder Mohan, Partner and Shri A. N. Verma, Assistant Labour Commissioner as their witnesses and closed their case.

The case was fixed for evidence of the workman on 23rd October, 1979. The workman failed to adduce his evidence till 19th February, 1981. The case of the workman was closed on 19th February, 1981, when no one appeared on behalf of the workman. Arguments on behalf of the management were fixed in the absence of the workman. The workman representative sent application which has been dated 19th February, 1981 for setting aside the order passed on 19th February, 1981 but the same was rejected as it did not disclose any reasonable and sufficient grounds for setting aside the orders and the workman had been allowed more than sufficient opportunities to lead his evidence. I decide the issues as under:—

Issue No. 1 —

The management witness M.W.3 Shri Surinder Mohan partner deposed that Kasturi Lal was employed with them for the last 8 to 9 years. He worked up to 5th April, 1978 and then after continued remaining absent up to the end of June, 1978. He further stated that the show-cause notice was given to the workman after 5 days of his being absent which is Ex. M-3 under registered cover. The postal receipt is Ex. M-4 and the acknowledgement duly signed by workman at point 'A' was Exhibit M-5. M.W.3 has further stated that during conciliation meeting the management offered to take the workman back on duty but he refused to join in the presence of the Labour Officer Shri A. N. Verma. The management did not terminate his services. He further stated that since the date of his abandonment the workman is employed with M/s Mukand Singh and Sons Yamuna Nagar on better salary. The statement of Shri Surinder Mohan has been corroborated by Shri Ram Sarup, Contractor as well as Shri H. C. Bhatnagar and A. N. Verma to the extant that the management filed their comments in which they stated that the management was ready to take the workman back on duty and that they had not terminated the services of the workman rather he himself left the services of the management on his own accord. The workman has not cared to come into the witness box to prove his case and rebut the evidence produced by the management inspite of 8 to 9 opportunities given to him since 23rd October, 1979 to 19th February, 1981 leading me to conclude that the workman was not interested in his reinstatement with the management further leading me to infer that the workman left the services of the management of his own accord. The issue is accordingly decided in favour of management.

In view of my findings on issue No. 1 all the other issues need no decision. I answer the reference and give my award that the workman left the services of the management of his own accord by remaining absent and the management had not terminated the services of the workman. The workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated, the 17th July, 1982.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 1752, dated 19th July, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 9 (1)82-6Lab./7588.— In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Philadelphia Hospital, Ambala City: —

**BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK**

Reference No. 172 of 79

between

**SHRI NASEEM BHATTI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S
PHILADELPHIA HOSPITAL, AMBALA CITY**

Present.—

Shri Rajeshwar Nath, alongwith the workman.

No one for the management.

AWARD

This reference has been referred to this Court, by the Hon'ble Governor,—*vide* his order No. ID/Amb/135-79/41026, dated 18th September, 1979, under section 10 (i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, for adjudication, of the dispute existing between Shri Naseem Bhatti, workman and the management of M/s Philadelphia Hospital, Ambala City. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Naseem Bhatti, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties put in their appearance on 25th October, 1979. The management was proceeded against *ex parte* on 21st March, 1980. *Ex parte* order was set aside on payment of Rs. 50 as cost. On the pleading of the parties the only issue 'As per the term of reference' was framed. The management examined Shri Pritam Singh, Secretary, respondent-management as their only witness and closed their case. The workman examined Shri Benjiman, Business Manager on 21st July, 1981. On 14th September, 1981 no one appeared for the management. Fresh notice was issued to them for 19th October, 1980. On this date of hearing also no one appeared on behalf of the management. The management was proceeded against *ex parte*. *Ex parte* statement of the workman was recorded on 20th October, 1981. I heard the arguments on behalf of the workman in the absence of the management and decided the issue as under:

ISSUE

The pleadings and the evidence of the management are not consistent. The management has pleaded in para 1 of their written statement that the applicant joined services of the respondent hospital a few years back while the management has produced evidence that on the application Ex. MW-1/5, dated 4th May, 1977 the workman was appointed,—*vide* order Ex. MW-1/6, dated 27th September, 1978. The workman reported on duty on 27th September, 1978,—*vide* Ex. MW-1/7. On 4th January, 1979 his contract of service was renewed for three months expiring on 31st March, 1979. The management witness has further admitted in his cross-examination that the pay of the workman was paid from the Property Agent Account maintained in the hospital. This statement was made by the witness on the basis of the statement prepared by the accounts department for the period from January, 70 to June, 76. The witness further admitted that all the property including the hospital and the mission compound belonged to UCNITA.

The workman is also on the same footing with the management where as in his claim statement he has alleged that he was employed with the management for the last 25 years while in his statement appearing as WW-2 he has deposed that he had been working with the respondent as Chowkidar w.e.f. 15th May, 1976. No notice nor any notice pay or retrenchment compensation was paid to him at the time of his termination. The management witness Shri Pritam Singh had deposed that the workman was of the age of 70 to 75. He was not put any question in this cross-examination nor the applicant rebutted the statement of MW-1 in his evidence. I am also of the view that the workman is 70 to 75 years old by appearance. The job of chowkidar is of such a nature which an old man of the age of the workman would not be able to perform efficiently. The management on the other hand has taken to unfair labour practice in terminating the services of the workman in obtaining the application of the workman for appointment as chowkidar on 4th May, 1977 and his appointment on 27th September, 1978 and the admission in their written statement that the workman was working with them for the last few years do cast doubts about the *bona fide* intention of the management in terminating the services of the workman. The termination of the workman without assigning any reason or complying with provisions of section 25 (F) is neither justified nor in order but under the circumstances of the case reinstatement of the workman will not be justified and the adequate compensation to the tune of Rs. 2,000 will be sufficient relief to the workman. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated the 17th July, 1982.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 1753, dated 19th July, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.